

Date: Sun, 3 Oct 93 04:30:10 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #361  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 3 Oct 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 361

Today's Topics:

                    5 wpm is Enough  
                    Codeless Tech Debate (2 msgs)  
            Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective) (2 msgs)  
                    End-It All Now, Please...  
                    Power Level Limits

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Sat, 2 Oct 93 20:43:38 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 5 wpm is Enough  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

There is no longer any good reason to require knowledge of Morse code  
at speeds greater than 5 words per minute. In the old days manual cw  
was the primary mode of all hams and the ability to use Morse code at  
high speeds was an important ability of the skilled operator.

Today cw on the hf bands is just one of many modes that todays hams  
have available. But the rules still require mastery of Morse code at  
13 wpm for hf access. For many hams this one mode requires over 75  
% of the study time for the ham licensing test. Why, when there are so  
many options for ham radio, is mastery of Morse code still required.  
Morse is no longer used for marine radio and has few applications  
outside of amateur radio. Morse is becoming an obsolete skill about  
as useful, to most people, as the ability to harness a team of horses

to a buggy.

Listening to the hf bands indicate that Morse fails as a lid filter. All of the lids on 160 through 15 meters passed a Morse test at 13 + wpm. It is time to change the requirements.

Reduce the code requirement to 5 wpm. Expand the part of the test on operating methods and practices. Change the format of some parts of the test to fill in the blanks rather than multiple guess. Make the test more meaningful to current and future hams.

It is time to stop considering the ability to receive 20 wpm Morse as the only important skill in ham radio. Morse is only one of many methods a ham may use, it is time to end its dominance of the tests.

There is a group of people who try to relive old days of the fur trappers, They use horses to pull their wagons, dress in buckskin. shoot black powder rifles and try to relive the 1850s, they are called buck skinners. Morse code fans are the buck skinners of amateur radio. They are welcome to practice their "mode of the past" but there is no reason to force it on the rest of us.

Down with the non-codeless hams !

Rod Anderson NONZO

```
--
Rod Anderson          | "I do not think the United States government
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
                        | fanatics decided to kill themselves"
Clinton, Gore, gone in four | Slick Willie the Compassionate
```

-----  
Date: 1 Oct 93 14:16:19 GMT  
From: ogicse!mbsun.mlb.org!yyz!115-119!Dan.Pickersgill.N8PKV@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

>  
> >jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

> >  
> >>I do think there are others like me - people with this peculiar  
> >>inability to distinguish closely-spaced sounds.

I have a friend who could pass all the therapy tests (even the commercial tests) with just a little study. However, his hearing will not distinguish between a dit and a dah. A, N, I and M all sound the same to him. Our only hope is to find someone to give him the 5WPM code test AT 5WPM\_CHARACTER SPEED\_. Where the differences are barely enough for him to attempt copy. After that is the old medical waiver (see below).

>  
> In article <kg7bk.749109358@indirect.com>  
> kg7bk@indirect.com (Cecil Moore) writes:  
>  
> >I've often wondered about handicapped hams. I know a blind guy who can  
> >copy CW just fine but has no idea what frequency he's on. Are deaf hams  
> >limited to vhf/uhf packet because they can't copy CW?  
>  
> Unless they can transcribe Morse code by watching a flashing light or  
> sensing the vibrations of a buzzer with their fingertips, they are  
> pretty much out of amateur radio.

At a time when amateur radio is dying for lack of interest and band with is being lost because of lack of use, that is a sorry commentary! Sorry because some people actually feel that way!

They can now get a medical waiver,  
> of course, but that wouldn't agree with the prevailing dogma that  
> anyone can learn the code and they wouldn't be "real hams".

You have to pass 5 WPM! FIRST! The medical waiver is for the 13/20 WPM tests.  
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

>  
> >... With all the digital modes, including computer-copied CW, it would  
> >seem that manually copying CW is like having to know how to use a slide  
> >rule... Hey, Jim, maybe they will let you use your slide rule to copy CW.  
>

---  
\* Origin: The Chicago Internet Gateway [CHIGATE.MCS.COM] (1:115/119.0)  
SEEN-BY: 115/747 2200/3 2112  
@PATH: 115/999 119 747 2200/2112  
2200/3 2112  
@PATH: 115/999 119 747 2200/2112

-----

Date: 2 Oct 93 21:35:34  
From: sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!  
news.cs.columbia.edu!popovich@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <aba\_9310020805@yyz.mbsun.mlb.org>  
mbsun.mlb.org!yyz!115-119!Bruce.Burke.Sp.App (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

> Morse Code is required below 30Mhz by international law.

A treaty that is widely ignored by other nations, and a requirement that nearly got changed at the last WARC if I'm remembering correctly; I seem to recall that it took some convincing by the U.S. delegation to keep the code requirement. Basically, the U.S. seems to be the last major hold-out on Morse code below 30 MHz.

-Steve, WB3I

-----  
Date: 1 Oct 93 20:02:28 GMT  
From: ogicse!mbsun.mlb.org!yyz!115-119!Ben.Coleman@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> According to other VE sources in this area, there have actually been  
> cases where an individual "guessed" correctly on 7 out of the 10  
> questions, but the VE team was not going to award him credit and  
> a CSCE because he did not have the necessary copy on his code  
> sheet. Apparently, only after a very loud disagreement on the  
> part of several of the testing VEs did they "agree" to give him  
> the credit.

>  
> Personally, I think it is a very dangerous precedent. Do we  
> next allow VEs to decide whether or not the person who took the  
> theory exam "really knew" the theory, or did the testee  
> just "guess" - thus allowing the VEs to throw the testee's  
> answer sheet out the door? As it is now, VEs are allowed  
> to put their own "comments" on a person's CW disability  
> waiver - hmmm, I guess VEs will have to be accredited in  
> all fields of the medical profession soon too, huh?

On the other hand, as an examiner, what do you do when an examinee has the requisite 7 correct answers on the 10-question test, but his/her copy doesn't even have enough to make guesses(e.g. at most 2 or 3 character

groups scattered seemingly randomly through the text)? At that point, you can be 99% sure that the examinee's answers come not from his/her code copy, but from his/her neighbor's test.

Ben

```
+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J | "All that is not eternal is |
| AX.25: NJ8J@W4Q0.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA | eternally out of date." |
| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us | C. S. Lewis |
+-----+-----+
```

---

\* Origin: The Chicago Internet Gateway [CHIGATE.MCS.COM] (1:115/119.0)  
SEEN-BY: 115/747 2200/3 2112  
@PATH: 115/999 119 747 2200/2112  
112  
@PATH: 115/999 119 747 2200/2112

-----

Date: 2 Oct 93 21:31:26  
From: sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!  
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.cs.columbia.edu!popovich@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <TiVqac1w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us>  
ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:

> On the other hand, as an examiner, what do you do when an examinee has the  
> requisite 7 correct answers on the 10-question test, but his/her copy  
> doesn't even have enough to make guesses(e.g. at most 2 or 3 character  
> groups scattered seemingly randomly through the text)? At that point, you  
> can be 99% sure that the examinee's answers come not from his/her code copy,  
> but from his/her neighbor's test.

What would you do if the "copy sheet" had only notes about the content of the QSO, and no actual copy? You know, if he copied the test the same way that most people actually operate CW...if they write down anything at all, that is. That's fine with me. Or if somebody turns in a blank "copy sheet"? Maybe he copied it in his head and has a good memory. The case that you bring up is a little harder for me to judge, because the random groups seem to indicate an attempt to actually copy the code down on the sheet. No matter what, though, I wouldn't try to accuse someone of cheating on a test unless I actually saw him doing it.

-Steve, WB3I  
ARRL VE

-----  
Date: 2 Oct 93 17:10:27 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!cbr600@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: End-It All Now, Please...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Please, everyone...let's end this no-code debate now...The no-code license is a part of Amateur Radio now, so the debate over it is useless. As for the HF privldges, international treaty states any amateur radio station in the world operating below 30 mHz must express some knowledge of code, so HF privldges can not be given to the no-coders. The new no-code license allows many other people to be involved in a terriffic hobby (like myself, who was scared away from Amateur Radio by the code requirement), and fulfills the need for more licensed amateur radio operators, to help the amateur service retain frequencys. Face it, you OF's, the No-Coders are here. Face it, No-Coders, at no time soon are we going to have HF privldges, so you might as well start practicing Morse.

Standard Disclaimers Apply...

-----  
Jeremy L. Utley	I didn't do it, nobody saw me
cbr600@ksuvm (Bitnet)	do it, You can't prove any-
cbr600@matt.ksu.ksu.edu (Internet)	thing. - Bart Simpson
NOYAX@WZOM.KS.USA.NA	
-----

-----  
Date: 1 Oct 1993 14:35:47 +0100  
From: swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!warwick!  
news.wlv.ac.uk!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Power Level Limits  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello Everybody,

I hope I've posted this in the right place - this seems the most relevant of the various newsgroups I get. The following note appeared in the German magazine DUBUS intended, primarily, for VHF/UHF DXers. Has anybody got any further information on this particularly the quoted ANSI standard ? This is causing some concern in Europe (I am chairman of the RSGB's VHF Committee - we worry about this sort of thing )

Planned new regulations put a threat on DX-operation on VHF/UHF and SHF in Germany. German BMPT (like FCC in USA) tries to limit output power to 100W on 144, 432 and 1296 MHz. Second, very hard limits are required for unwanted emissions of amateur stations (-120 dB!!). The reason given for the first measure is possible hazardous impact on the health because of EMR. The second measure has been forced by the broadcast and television companies who want to protect their cable networks against amateur radiation. These efforts of German PTT are symptomatic for administrations in Europe and all VHF amateurs should be aware that future common European regulations would be the worst common divisor according to our experiences with EC-bureaucrats. Also in the US the new ANSI Standard C95.1-1992 which has been adopted by FCC, will force administrations to reconsider amateur power levels on VHF/UHF.

Rainer DJ9BV

From: Peter Burden, School of Computing & IT	When all else fails ---
University of Wolverhampton	read the instructions
Phone: (+44 902)-322105 (DDI)	
Fax: (+44-902)-322680	If the good Lord had meant
Internet email to jphb@scitsc.wlv.ac.uk	meant us to program in Ada
Packet radio messages to G3UBX @ GB7MAX	why did he give us Fortran

Date: 2 Oct 93 17:48:18 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <30SEP93.05370230@skyfox>, <1993Sep30.170201.27381@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CE6z14.4B7@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: The Canadian Perspective Returns

In article <CE6z14.4B7@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:  
>In article <1993Sep30.170201.27381@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:





In conversations with other trustees in the area, I haven't heard the first claim of \*increased\* instances of bad behavior in the last 2.5 years. We're not some backwater aberration either. We have the widest area coverage machine in the 12th largest metropolitan area in the US. Many of our users are newly minted Techs who are always made to feel welcome. Perhaps that has something to do with the lack of problems.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #361

\*\*\*\*\*